

back to our constitutional underpinnings. We need to reject ObamaCare.

I want to see this House vote again this summer after the Supreme Court decision, no matter what the Supreme Court decision is, and I'm optimistic about getting a constitutional decision from the Supreme Court. But I want to see this Congress vote again for a 100 percent repeal of ObamaCare so everybody's on record, everybody understands that it must all go. It must all be pulled out by the roots. There can be no vestige of ObamaCare left behind. It's an unconstitutional taking of American liberty. In a vigorous Nation, Mr. Speaker, we cannot reach our destiny if we are tied to the anchor of ObamaCare that directs and rules our lives and consumes about 17 or more percent of our gross domestic product.

And so the difference is this: The troika of HARRY REID, NANCY PELOSI, and Barack Obama has been broken. It was broken in the election of 2010 when they saw the extra-constitutional reach of ObamaCare. They saw the effort on cap-and-trade. They saw Dodd-Frank pass through the House and the Senate and become law, an overreach. You had the people involved in the solution for the economic downward spiral that were contributing to the problem.

There are a whole series of things that we need to put this aright, Mr. Speaker. One of them is to scrub out the regulations that have been put in place in an effort to try to implement cap-and-trade around the resistance of this United States Congress, the separation of powers that's clear in the Constitution itself between the legislative and the executive and the judicial branches of government. I'm just very confident that Barack Obama taught those separations of powers, that the article I component of this that says, Here, this is how we set up the legislature. They set the laws. They set the policy, and the establishment of the executive branch of government whose job it is to carry out the laws and take care that the laws are faithfully executed.

□ 1430

We have a President who apparently encourages someone like Eric Holder to disregard especially immigration laws and only enforce those laws that, let me say, do not make them politically vulnerable. They decided they had 300,000 people that were in this country illegally that had been already adjudicated for deportation, and they said we don't have the resources to enforce the law against everybody that's here illegally, and so they committed their resources to going back through the files, looking through 300,000 forms of people that had been adjudicated for deportation and coming up with a reason or an excuse to try to let them stay in America, to try to turn another blind eye. Those resources had already been used to enforce the law; all they

had to do was follow through with the directive of Congress.

The administration created this new argument that has never been heard before, I think, in the history of jurisprudence that Congress had directed the executive branch—this is in their assertion in the Arizona immigration case—to establish and maintain a “careful balance” between the various immigration laws because it affects the different interests of the executive branch.

Enforcing immigration affects our foreign relations, so the State Department has an interest. It affects our homeland security, so Janet Napolitano has an interest. It affects, perhaps, the educational system, and so you have the Secretary of Education with an interest. And it goes on and on and on. These are not competing interests. Congress has directed that all of these laws be faithfully enforced, and the administration has refused. That's a new approach to, let me say, prosecutorial discretion, Mr. Speaker. It goes on and on.

We have to repeal ObamaCare, repeal Dodd-Frank, pass a balanced-budget amendment to the United States Constitution. It's clear this Congress doesn't have the will to balance the budget. Maybe a simple majority in the House could be convinced to do so; it would be very tough. You can't get it done in the United States Senate. Even if we could balance the budget, we can't keep that happening year after year and pay down and then off this national debt. We need a balanced-budget amendment to the United States Constitution.

My advice, Mr. Speaker, to the next President of the United States would clearly be: refuse to sign a debt ceiling increase as President unless and until the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States pass an acceptable balanced-budget amendment out of each Chamber that's identical in message to the States for ratification. If we can get that done, then there is a justification to give a short-term extension to our debt ceiling here in this Congress. If not, we need to hold the line until such time as the will is brought into this Congress to bring forth a balanced budget and to pay down and then off our national debt.

My youngest little granddaughter, Reagan Ann King, was born about 19— or maybe now 20 months—ago. Into the world she came with her share of the national debt at \$44,000. I looked at that little girl and I thought, you know, a typical student loan might be \$24,000, might be \$30,000, but she's got a \$44,000 loan and a mortgage on her head with interest accumulating every day, and she has just drawn her first breath. By the time she turned 1 year old, her share of the national debt was \$48,000. And this little blonde-haired, brightest blue-eyed little girl with a beautiful giggle and smile doesn't know what kind of responsibility has been stuck on her by people that are living today

at her expense and the expense of all of those babies that have been born and those yet to be born that will be taxpayers—and only about half of them fit that category today.

So, Mr. Speaker, that little girl turned 1½ years old, and now her \$44,000 debt that was \$48,000 on her first birthday, it became \$51,000 when she's 1½ years old. She's going to be a taxpayer and a producer, and so you have to take that times two because only half the people have a Federal income tax liability.

So, \$102,000 on the head of every American, young and old, that's our national debt. And we've watched trillion-dollar deficits roll up over the last 3½ years. The President's budget came to this floor at \$1.33 trillion in deficit—\$1.33 trillion, Mr. Speaker—and now we're approaching \$16 trillion in national debt and it's got to stop.

We have to turn this country around. The American voters spoke in 2010. They sent 87 freshmen here into this House of Representatives who are constitutional conservatives, and every one of them voted to repeal ObamaCare. They want a balanced budget; they want a balanced-budget amendment. They are God's gift to America.

We need another one in November 2012, and more fresh faces and more vigorous people here that will adhere to repeal of ObamaCare, a balanced-budget amendment, an all-of-the-above energy plan. We need more of the same kind of people in the United States Senate and a President that will sign that legislation into law. I look forward to the privilege to work with those new faces as they arrive here and work to make the case before the American people every day from now until November, and thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHILLING (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending a family funeral.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family function.

Ms. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 5, 2012, at noon for morning-hour debate.